DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 274 AC 010 871

AUTHOR Ledford, William D.; Dotson, Robert S.
TITLE Homegrounds Improvement Practices of Selected Homeowners and Renters in Polk County, Tennessee. A Research Summary of a Graduate Study.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Agricultural Extension Service.
PUB DATE Sep 71
NOTE 28p.; Extension Study No. 16

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Attitudes; Extension Agents; Information Seeking; *Landscaping; *Maintenance; Nurseries (Horticulture); *Turf Management

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to determine the homegrounds improvement situation among 4-H families in Polk County, Tennessee. It was conducted for the purposes of: (1) obtaining information concerning characteristics of homeowners and renters, (2) determining which recommended homegrounds improvement practices they were using, and (3) identifying some of the factors influencing them to adopt practices. Representatives of 84 4-H families (65 homeowners and 19 renters) were interviewed in random samples for comparison. Data were analyzed in numbers and percent, and adoption levels of homeowners and renters were compared on the basis of practice diffusion ratings. Findings disclosed that the average interviewee in this study in 1966 had the following characteristics: (1) was about 44 years of age, (2) had completed about nine years of schooling, (3) was a rural non-farm resident, (4) was a housewife, and (5) lived in a house built between 1950-59. Homeowner families were more often farm families, older, first occupants of their homes, lived in homes built between 1950-1959, and spent more money for plants than did renter families. With regard to the adoption of 27 recommended practices studied, homeowners were consistently farther along than were renters on nearly all practices. With regard to eight attitude toward landscaping statements and eight attitude toward nurseries statements, renters had better attitudes than did homeowners on most of the statements. More owners than renters reported larger inventories of trees and shrubs. (Author/CK)

ED055274

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RESEARCH SUMM. ULTURAL EXTENSION

Extension Study No. 16
S. C. 782

A Research Summary of a Graduate Study

HOMEGROUNDS IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES OF SELECTED HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS IN POLK COUNTY, TENNESSEE

William D. Ledford
and
Robert S. Dotson

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION EDUCATION
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

September 1971

1

AC 010 871

ED055274

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	ABSTRACT	ii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purposes	1
	Research Methodology	1
	Related Literature	2
II.	MAJOR FINDINGS	3
	Findings Related to Characteristics of Homeowners and Renters	3
	Findings Related to Homegrounds Improvement Practices	6
	Findings Related to Attitudes Toward Landscaping	9
	Findings Related to Attitudes Toward Nurseries	9
III.	IMPLICATIONS	10
IV.	RECOMMENDATIONS	11
	LIST OF REFERENCES	12
	APPENDIX	14
	Table 1	15
	Table 2	18

HOMEGROUNDS IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES OF SELECTED HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS IN POLK COUNTY, TENNESSEE

by

William Donald Ledford

August 1969

ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken to determine the homegrounds improvement situation among 4-H families in Polk County, Tennessee. It was conducted for the purposes of: (1) obtaining information concerning characteristics of homeowners and renters; (2) determining which recommended homegrounds improvement practices they were using, and (3) identifying some of the factors influencing them to adopt practices. Representatives of 84 4-H families (65 homeowners and 19 renters) were interviewed in random samples for comparison. Data were analyzed in numbers and percent, and adoption levels of homeowners and renters were compared on the basis of practice diffusion ratings.

Findings disclosed that the average interviewee in this study in 1966 had the following characteristics; (1) was about 44 years of age; (2) had completed about 9 years of schooling; (3) was a rural non-farm resident; (4) was a housewife and (5) lived in a house built between 1950-1959. Homeowner families interviewed were more often farm families, older, first occupants of their homes, lived in homes built between 1950-1959, and spent more money for plants than did renter families.

With regard to the adoption of 27 recommended practices studied, homeowners consistently were farther along in the diffusion process than were renters on nearly all practices. Greatest differences between the two groups, in order, were noted on: (1) "planting grass at recommended times"; (2) "filling bottoms of holes with topsoil and remainder with subsoil when transplanting"; (3) "planting desirable varieties of grass"; (4) "preparing desirable seedbeds before planting lawns"; (5) "mulching lawns properly when newly seeded"; (6) "preparing holes for trees and shrubs 6-12 inches wider and deeper than the size of the earthball"; (7) "removing burlap from balled trees and shrubs before transplanting"; (8) "watering lawns adequately when newly seeded", and (9) "pruning trees and shrubs at recommended times and in recommended ways." Both the homeowners and renters were "planning to try" most practices; although, the former had a slightly higher total average practice diffusion rate than did the latter.

With regard to eight attitude toward landscaping statements, renters had better attitudes than did homeowners on most of the eight attitude statements. Greatest differences between the two groups, in order, were noted on: (1) "landscaping with trees and shrubs involves too much work"; (2) "landscaping with trees and shrubs costs too much money"; (3) "landscaping with trees and shrubs is nothing more than an effort to keep up with the Joneses", and (4) "nothing gives as much satisfaction to a homeowner as having his home well-landscaped with trees and shrubs."

Both homeowners and renters had "favorable" total average attitude scores, but renters were slightly more favorable.

With regard to eight attitude toward nurseries statements, renters again had better attitudes than did homeowners on most of the eight attitude statements. Greatest differences between the two groups, in order, were noted on: (1) "the trees and shrubs sold by local nurseries are better than those sold by other outlets"; (2)"nurseries are too eager to sell"; (3) "nurseries use too many technical names for trees and shrubs"; and (4) "you can depend on information given by nurseries." Both homeowners and renters had "neutral" total average attitude scores, but renters were slightly more favorable.

More owners than renters reported larger inventories of most of 77 trees and shrubs studied in homegrounds plantings.

Recommendations were made for use of the findings and additional research.

RESEARCH SUMMARY*

I. INTRODUCTION

In order for Extension workers in Polk County to have a basis for making long-range educational plans in the homegrounds improvement work area, benchmark data with regard to homeowners and renters and their practices were needed.

Purposes

The purposes of this study were: (1) to obtain basic information concerning the characteristics of homeowners and renters in Polk County; (2) to determine which recommended homegrounds improvement practices the homeowners and renters were using, and (3) to identify some of the factors that influenced them to adopt or reject the practices.

Research Methodology

Eighty-four parents of 4-H Club members were randomly selected for this study. All were interviewed in 1966.

The interview schedule used in the study was developed with the assistance of the Extension Departments of Horticulture and Training and Studies of The University of Tennessee. Analyses were made in simple numbers, percents and averages, according to all homeowners and renters interviewed.

---

*Robert S. Dotson, Professor and Head, Agricultural Extension Education The University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, Knoxville, Tennessee.

William D. Ledford, Extension Leader, Agricultural Extension Service, Benton, Tennessee.

The homeowners and renters interviewed were questioned concerning their use of 27 recommended homegrounds improvement practices, and, as a result were given practice diffusion ratings ranging from zero, "unaware," to five, "using." Average practice diffusion ratings were established for all interviewees, homeowners and renters. The practice diffusion ratings were used in comparing the adoption levels of the different ownership groups in relation to the recommended practices.

The average practice diffusion rating intervals were: (0) 0.00-0.49, "unaware"; (1) 0.50-1.49, "aware"; (2) 1.50-2.49, "interested"; (3) 2.50-3.49, "planning to try"; (4) 3.50-4.49, "tried, but not now using"; and (5) 4.5-5.0, "using."

Related Literature

A review of related literature disclosed little research had been done to compare homeowners and renters. Research regarding nursery item purchases of consumers in general and factors affecting practice adoption were found to be available.

Factors found to influence practice adoption of similar groups in previous studies included: socio-economic status; contact with Extension workers; age and educational level; size of farm, tenure and location; sex, attitude toward nurseries, attitude toward landscaping and knowledge concerning homegrounds improvement.

Things consumers liked about nursery purchases included: beauty; shade; fruit; privacy, and use in interior decoration. Things disliked, according to an earlier study, included: slow growth; non-blooming; dead look in winter, and thorns.

II. MAJOR FINDINGS

Findings Related to Characteristics of Homeowners and Renters

With regard to the characteristics of homeowners and renters, listed below are some of the principal findings.

1. More than one-half (53 percent) of all families were rural non-farmers (49 percent of the homeowners and 68 percent of the renters), farming being reported by 47 percent of all families (51 percent of the homeowners and 32 percent of the renters).

2. Seventy-four percent of all the interviewees were female (71 percent of the homeowners and 84 percent of the renters).

3. Sixty percent of all the interviewees were housewives (63 percent of the homeowners and 48 percent of the renters). Twenty-nine percent of all the interviewees were wage earners (23 percent of the homeowners and 47 percent of the renters).

4. The average educational grade level for all interviewees was 8.9. There was very little difference between homeowners and renters in grade level.

5. Average ages were 44 years for all interviewees, 46 for the homeowners and 38 years for renters.

6. Fifty-five percent of all the interviewees were not the first occupants of their present home (43 percent of the homeowners and 95 percent of the renters).

7. Forty-nine percent of the houses of all interviewees were built between 1950-1959 (54 percent of the homeowners and 32 percent of the renters).

8. Seventy-nine percent of all the interviewees had not visited a nursery or garden center in 1966.

9. Sixty-seven percent of all the interviewees had spent no money during the previous five years (1961-66) for plants (60 percent of the homeowners and 90 percent of the renters). Twenty-four percent of all the interviewees had spent from $1 to $24 during the previous five years for plants (28 percent of the homeowners and 10 percent of the renters).

10. Sixty percent of all the interviewees said both husband and wife had made the decisions concerning what trees and shrubs to purchase (54 percent of the homeowners and 79 percent of the renters). Ranking next was the wife with 27 percent (29 percent of the homeowners and 21 percent of the renters).

11. Sixty-two percent of all the interviewees stated that they made the decisions jointly (husband and wife) concerning what was to be done with their homegrounds (59 percent of the homeowners and 74 percent of the renters). Ranking second was the wife with 24 percent of the total.

12. Fifty-eight percent of all the interviewees rated the condition of their homegrounds as "fair." An additional 25 percent ranked their homegrounds "good," 26 percent of the homeowners and 21 percent of the renters so reporting.

13. According to the interviewer's ratings of the condition of shrubs and/or trees of all the interviewees, 60 percent rated "fair," 58 percent of the homeowners and 63 percent of the renters so indicating. Thirty-eight percent of the total rated "good," 42 percent of the homeowners and 27 percent of the renters.

14. According to the interviewer's ratings of the condition of the lawn, 56 percent of all the interviewees' lawns rated "fair." Both homeowners and renters were similar. Twenty-four percent of the total lawns rated "poor" (19 percent of the homeowners and 42 percent of the renters).

15. According to the interviewer's ratings of the basic landscaping plan, 49 percent of all interviewees had plans rated "fair," 46 percent of the homeowners and 58 percent of the renters so indicating. Thirty-four percent of all plans were rated "poor," 36 percent of the homeowners and 32 percent of the renters so reporting.

16. Ninety-five percent of all the interviewees, according to the interviewer, should have been paying more attention to the improvement of their homegrounds. Ownership groups did not differ.

17. Fifty-one percent of all the interviewees, according to the interviewer, were "very" or "somewhat" interested in improving their homegrounds, 57 percent of the homeowners and 31 percent of the renters so reporting. Forty-one percent of the total were "not interested" (37 percent of the homeowners and 53 percent of the renters).

18. Eighty-one percent of all the interviewees had either "friendly" or "somewhat friendly" attitude toward the survey, according to the interviewer. Ownership groups did not differ. None was "antagonistic."

Findings Related to Homegrounds Improvement Practices

A summary of major findings related to the adoption of 27 recommended homegrounds improvement practices by those interviewed are listed below.

1. Homeowners had higher average practice diffusion ratings than renters on 25 of the 27 recommended homegrounds improvement practices.

2. The homeowners (2.93), on the average, were "planning to try" the practice, whereas, the renters (2.47) were only "interested" in the practices.

3. Greatest differences between homeowners and renters average practice diffusion ratings were noted for the following practices: (a) "planted grass at recommended time"; (b) "filled bottom of hole with topsoil and remainder with subsoil when transplanting shrubs and trees"; (c) "planted a desirable variety of grass"; (d) "prepared a desirable seedbed before planting lawns"; (e) "mulched the lawn properly when newly seeded"; (f) "prepared a hole for trees and shrubs

6-12 inches wider and deeper than the ball"; (g) "removed burlap from balled trees and shrubs before transplanting"; (h) "watered lawn adequately when newly seeded," and (i) "pruned trees and shrubs at recommended times and in recommended ways."

4. Both the homeowners and renters rated "shade trees" as the item most liked in their yards.

(5) Twenty-nine percent of all the interviewees did not list anything as "disliked" about their yeards. Twenty-three percent of the total interviewed listed "not level" as the thing they disliked most about their yards.

6. Thirty-four percent of the total interviewed gave no evidence of having plans for the future improvement and maintenance of their homegrounds, 28 percent of the homeowners and 58 percent of the renters so indicating. Fifty-nine percent of the total interviewed gave evidence of planning to use one or two practices, 63 percent of the homeowners compared to 42 percent of the renters here included.

7. Sisty-six percent of those interviewed had plans for improving their homegrounds. Seventy-two percent of the homeowners and 42 percent of the renters had plans. "Renting" was the most popular response given by those not having plans when asked the reason with 58 percent of the renters so indicating.

8. Eighty-six percent of the total interviewed sought advice from no one, 83 percent of the homeowners and 95 percent of the renters so indicating. "Neighbors or friends" was indicated as the person or persons from whom most of the interviewees had sought homegrounds improvement advice, 16 percent of the homeowners and 5 percent of the renters so reporting. "Extension personnel" was selected on the second most frequently mentioned source from whom interviewees sought homegrounds improvement advice.

9. Eighty-two percent of the total interviewed were "not known" by the interviewer, 80 percent of the homeowners compared to 89 percent of the renters. This might be accounted for because the interviewer had only been in the county two years when this survey was started.

10. Seventy-four percent reported they received no source of useful information concerning the improvement and/or maintenance of homegrounds. Twenty-four percent reported "farm magazines" as their first source of useful information. Twenty-six percent of the homeowners and 16 percent of the renters were included. Daily newspapers ranked second in mention with 18 percent of the total interviewed selecting it. Fifteen percent of the homeowners and 26 percent of the renters so indicating selected this source. Others rated in descending order of their importance were: television; commercial (seed company) bulletins, weekly newspaper and nursery catalogs; radio; university bulletins and publications, and newsletters.

Findings Related to Attitudes Toward Landscaping

A summary of major findings related to eight attitudes toward landscaping by those interviewed are listed below.

1. Renters had higher average attitude scores than did homeowners on six of the eight attitudes toward landscaping.

2. Both homeowners (3.76) and renters (3.87) had favorable average attitude scores, but the total average score for renters was slightly higher.

3. Greatest differences between renters and homeowners average attitudinal scores were noted for the following practices: (a) "landscaping with trees and shrubs involves too much work," (b) "landscaping a home with trees and shrubs costs too much money," (c) "landscaping with trees and shrubs is nothing more than effort to keep up with the Joneses," and (d) "nothing gives as much satisfaction to a homeowner as having his home well-landscaped with trees and shrubs."

Findings Related to Attitudes Toward Nurseries

A summary of major findings related to eight attitudes toward nurseries by those interviewed are listed below.

1. Renters had higher total average attitude scores than did homeowners on five of the eight attitudes toward nurseries.

2. Both homeowners (3.22) and renters (3.24) had neutral total average attitude scores, but the total average score for renters was slightly higher.

3. Greatest differences between renters and homeowners average attitudinal scores were noted for the following practices: (a) "the trees and shrubs sold by local nurseries are better than those sold by other outlets," (b) "nurseries are too eager to sell," (c) "nurseries use too many technical names for trees and shrubs," and (d) "you can depend on information given by nurseries."

III. IMPLICATIONS

Some of the implications that might be drawn from the findings of this benchmark study include the following:

1. Since four-fifths of all the interviewees were either "friendly" or "somewhat friendly" when visited, and nearly one-half of all the interviewees were at least "somewhat interested" in improving their homegrounds, and since 95 percent of all the interviewees according to the interviewer should have been paying more attention to the improvement of their homegrounds, it is implied that they need assistance and would be receptive to further intensive Extension efforts in the area of homegrounds improvement.

2. Because of the increase in the value of homes provided by well-planned and properly maintained homegrounds, the relatively large amounts of time and/or expense being devoted to the homegrounds by homeowners and renters alike, because of the apparent lack of information most interviewees had received on homegrounds improvement

and due to the benefits homegrounds improvement might ultimately provide to the county as concerned citizens seek to attract and encourage new individuals and industry, it would appear that an educational effort could be justified to encourage 4-H Club members, their parents, communities and public and private industries alike to undertake countywide home grounds improvement.

3. Since the renters and homeowners in the study seemed to have relatively favorable attitudes toward landscaping and nurseries, though the former were less familiar with both than the latter, an educational effort should be designed for these audiences taking into account such things as knowledge levels, previous experience, attitudes and practice diffusion ratings.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and implications of this study indicate that certain recommendations might be in order. They are listed below.

1. Factors found to be different between and within the two groups should be further analyzed, and results used in planning for more effective and efficient future educational homegrounds improvement work for Polk County, Tennessee, and similar counties.

2. Additional research is needed to identify other factors resulting in owner motivation and to design other educational methods useful in helping homeowners and renters to realize the potential value of their homegrounds.

3. Further research also should be done to compare different approaches and methods for teaching homegrounds improvement to determine which are relatively more effective.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Bradshaw, John. All About Landscaping. New York, New York: Leland Publishing Company, 1961.

2. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Agriculture, Polk County, Tennessee, 1964. Series AC 64-PL. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, May 1966.

3. Cleland, Charles L. Selected Population and Agricultural Statistics for Tennessee Counties. Bulletin No. 359. Agricultural Experiment Station, Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, January 1963.

4. Corry, Ormond C. "Estimate of Personal Income Per Capita--Tennessee Counties--1960-65 (Dollars)," Tennessee Survey of Business. Bureau of Business and Economic Research. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, April 1967.

5. Corry, Ormond C. "Population Estimates for Tennessee Counties: 1967 and (Provisional) 1968," Tennessee Survey of Business. Vol. 4. Bureau of Business and Economic Research. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, March 1969.

6. Corry, Ormond C. "Total Population Estimate--Tennessee Counties: 1965 With Provisional 1966 Estimates and 1960-65 Components of Change," Tennessee Survey of Business. Bureau of Business and Economic Research. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, April 1967.

7. Garbarino, A. J. Practices and Preferences of Consumers for Horticultural Specialties in Knoxville and Nashville. Bulletin No. 323. Agricultural Experiment Station. Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, December 1960.

8. How Farm People Accept New Ideas. Farm Foundation and Federal Extension Service Cooperating, North Carolina Regional Publication No. 1. Special Report No. 15. Ames, Iowa: Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State College, November 1955.

9. Padgett, J. H., Wilbur Mull and T. L. Frazier.. The Effect of Merchandising Practices by Retail Nurserymen on Consumer Buying. Bulletin N. S. 140. Agricultural Experiment Station. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, June 1965.

10. Pease, Roger W. Consumer Purchases and Preferences in Landscaping. Bulletin 462. Agricultural Experiment Station. Morgantown, West Virginia: College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, The University of West Virginia, June 1961.

11. Pease, Roger W. Ornamentals--Consumer Response to (1) Distribution of Literature and (2) A Free Landscape Sketching Service. Bulletin 491. Agricultural Experiment Station. Morganton, West Virginia: College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, The University of West Virginia, May 1964.

12. Polk County, Tennessee, Annual Plan for 1967. Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, December 1966.

13. Polk County, Tennessee, 5-Year Plan (1967-71). Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, January 1967.

14. Thompson, Roger B. Landscape Planning. Publication 454. Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, October 1964.

15. Wilson, Meredith C. and Gladys Gallup. Extension Teaching Methods. Extension Service Circular 495. Federal Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, August 1955.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Table 1. AVERAGE HOME IMPROVEMENT PRACTICE DIFFUSION RATINGS AND TOTAL AVERAGE RATINGS OF ALL THOSE INTERVIEWED, HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS*

Home Improvement Practice	Total Interviewed (N=84) Average Rating	Homeowners (N=65) Average Rating	Renters (N=19) Average Rating
Planning (1-6)			
1. Considered appropriate items when selecting trees and shrubs	3.55	3.57	3.47
2. Considered mature size before selecting shrubs and trees	3.07	3.14	2.84
3. Arranged trees and shrubs so that yard centers were open	2.51	2.62	2.16
4. Avoided the use of too many types of mixtures of trees and shrubs in arrangements	1.49	1.60	1.11
5. Got the advice of professional in the area of homegrounds improvement and maintenance	1.46	1.54	1.21
6. Have drawn landscape plan for the homegrounds	0.96	1.03	.74
Establishment (7-22)			
7. Planted hardy, disease resistant trees and shrubs	4.42	4.45	4.32
8. Properly watered plants when transplanted	4.40	4.49	4.11
9. Transplanted trees and shrubs at recommended times	4.39	4.49	4.05
10. Prepared hole for trees and shrubs 6-12" wider and deeper	4.26	4.43	3.68

Table 1. (continued)

Home Improvement Practice	Total Interviewed (N=84) Average Rating	Homeowners (N=65) Average Rating	Renters (N=19) Average Rating
11. Filled bottom of hole with topsoil and remainder with subsoil when transplanting	3.77	4.03	2.89
12. Planted grass at recommended time	3.36	3.68	2.26
13. Planted desirable varieties of grass	3.35	3.58	2.53
14. Prepared desirable seedbed before planting lawns	3.23	3.43	2.53
15. Planted shrubs and trees the same depth they were before digging	3.17	3.20	3.05
16. Watered lawn adequately when newly seeded	2.87	3.03	2.32
17. Mulched lawn properly when newly seeded	2.79	2.98	2.11
18. Braced trees over 6' tall when transplanting them	2.70	2.80	2.37
19. Removed can from trees and shrubs before transplanting	2.44	2.55	2.05
20. Removed burlap from balled trees and shrubs before transplanting	2.29	2.45	1.74
21. Mulched the area around transplanted trees and shrubs	2.29	2.23	2.47
22. Protected long, bare stems of trees with burlap or other appropriate material from ground level to first branches to protect them from sun and pests	1.47	1.43	1.63
Maintenance (23-27)			
23. Pruned trees and shrubs at recommended times and in recommended ways	3.79	3.94	3.26

Table 1. (continued)

Home Improvement Practice	Total Interviewed (N=84) Average Rating	Homeowners (N=65) Average Rating	Renters (N=19) Average Rating
24. Treated trees and shrubs as recommended when disease or insect attacked them	3.01	3.08	2.79
25. Mowed grass at recommended heights as needed	2.68	2.72	2.53
26. Followed soil test recommendations last year	1.40	1.45	1.26
27. Tested homegrounds soil within last 5-years to determine the fertilize needs of trees and shrubs	1.26	1.28	1.21
Total Average Rating	2.83	2.93	2.47

*Interpreting the average ratings listed, the following intervals apply - 0 (0,00-0.49) = unaware; 1 (0.50-1.49) = aware of the practice; 2 (1.50-2.49) = interested in the practice; 3 (2.50-3.49) = planning to try the practice; 4 (3.50-4.49) = tried the practice but not now using it, and 5 (4.50-5.00) = using the practice.

Table 2. NUMBERS AND PERCENTS OF ALL POLK COUNTY HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS, HAVING VARIOUS SHRUBS AND TREES IN THEIR YARDS BY NUMBERS AND AVERAGE NUMBERS OF SHRUBS AND TREES

Name of Shrub or Tree	Homeowners (N=65) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting	Renters (N=19) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting
Azalea	2	3.1	5	2.5	1	5.3	1	1.0
Beautybush	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Bush Honey Suckle	6	9.2	13	2.2	0	0	0	0
Crape Myrtle	18	27.7	29	1.6	2	10.5	7	3.5
Deutzia	1	1.5	1	1.0	1	5.3	3	3.0
Forsythia	25	38.5	93	3.7	5	26.3	15	3.0
Fragrant Mock Orange	15	23.1	33	2.2	4	21.1	4	1.0
Hydrangea	7	10.8	8	1.1	1	5.3	1	1.0
Japanese Quince	12	18.5	37	3.1	5	26.3	9	1.8
Japanese Snowball	13	20.0	16	1.2	5	26.3	18	3.6
Showy Jasmine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spirea	17	26.2	87	5.1	8	42.1	45	5.6
Weigela	11	16.9	19	1.7	1	5.3	1	1.0
Wisteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2. (continued)

Name of Shrub or Tree	Homeowners (N=65) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting	Renters (N=19) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting
Viburnum	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Lilac	16	24.6	38	2.4	3	15.8	4	1.3
Apple	30	46.2	102	3.4	8	42.1	18	2.3
Ash	8	12.3	24	3.0	0	0	0	0
Beech	2	3.1	3	1.5	0	0	0	0
Blackgum	2	3.1	2	1.0	0	0	0	0
Black Locust	2	3.1	2	1.0	0	0	0	0
Cherry	11	16.9	31	2.8	4	21.1	9	2.3
Crab Apple	3	4.6	5	1.7	0	0	0	0
Dogwood	21	32.3	65	3.1	4	21.1	10	2.5
Elm	16	24.6	39	2.4	2	10.5	7	3.5
Hackberry	6	9.2	9	1.5	1	5.3	1	1.0
Hickory	9	13.8	44	4.9	2	10.5	3	1.5
Mimosa	34	52.3	158	4.6	9	47.4	54	6.0
Mulberry	7	10.8	20	2.9	2	10.5	5	2.5
Peach	15	23.0	40	2.7	1	5.3	1	1.0

Table 2. (continued)

Name of Shrub or Tree	Homeowners (N=65) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting	Renters (N=19) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting
Pecan	5	7.7	13	2.6	0	0	0	0
Plum	6	9.2	24	4.0	3	15.8	9	3.0
Redbud	3	4.6	5	1.7	0	0	0	0
Red Oak	14	21.5	116	8.3	1	5.3	2	2.0
Pin Oak	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maple Silver	8	12.3	29	3.6	1	5.3	1	1.0
Maple Sugar	20	30.8	73	3.7	8	42.1	18	2.3
Maple Other	25	38.5	52	2.1	2	10.5	2	1.0
Sassafras	2	3.1	5	2.5	0	0	0	0
Sourwood	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Sycamore	3	4.6	3	1.0	0	0	0	0
Sweet Gum	4	6.2	10	2.5	1	5.3	2	2.0
Tulip Poplar	7	10.8	17	2.4	2	10.5	7	3.5
Walnut	18	27.7	38	2.1	3	15.8	8	2.7
White Oak	15	23.1	45	3.0	0	0	0	0
Willow	9	13.8	9	1.0	1	5.3	1	1.0
Willow Oak	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2. (continued)

Name of Shrub or Tree	Homeowners (N=65) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting	Renters (N=19) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting
Arborvitae, Round	3	4.6	21	7.0	0	0	0	0
Arborvitae, Pyramidal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arborvitae, Upright	8	12.3	23	2.9	2	10.5	5	2.5
Yew, Spreading	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Yew, Upright	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spreading Juniper	5	7.7	20	4.0	0	0	0	0
Upright Juniper	7	10.8	14	2.0	2	10.5	3	1.5
Abelia	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Acuba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barberry Evergreen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holly Burford	3	4.6	5	1.7	1	5.3	4	4.0
Boxwood	11	16.9	84	7.6	6	31.6	38	6.3
Chinese Holly	2	3.1	3	1.5	0	0	0	0
Elaeagnus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laurel	1	1.5	3	3.0	0	0	0	0
Mahonia	1	1.5	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
Nandina	6	9.2	10	1.7	1	5.3	2	2.0

Table 2. (continued)

Name of Shrub or Tree	Homeowners (N=65) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting	Renters (N=19) No. Reporting	% Reporting	No. Shrubs or Trees	Av. No. Shrubs or Trees Per Person Reporting
Japanese Holly	3	4.6	11	3.7	1	5.3	3	3.0
Privet Hedge	24	36.9	623	25.9	11	57.9	113	10.3
Pyracantha	2	3.1	3	1.5	0	0	0	0
Rhododendron	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Viburnum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wax Leaf Privet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Holly	4	6.2	5	1.3	1	5.3	1	1.0
Canadian Hemlock	5	7.7	19	3.8	1	5.3	1	1.0
Eastern Red Cedar	14	21.5	97	6.9	6	31.6	9	1.5
Loblolly Pine	7	10.8	124	17.7	1	5.3	1	1.0
White Pine	12	18.5	39	3.3	1	5.3	5	5.0
Norway Spruce	4	6.2	7	1.8	0	0	0	0
Southern Magnolia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ERIC Clearinghouse
NOV 1 1 1971
on Adult Education

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture and U. S. Department of Agriculture
cooperating in furtherance of Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE
V. W. Darter, Dean